

REMARKS

Claims 108-162 are pending in the above-captioned patent application following this amendment. Claims 112, 113, 116, 117, 119, 120, 129, 131, 132, 134, 135, 144, 146, 152 and 154 were found to contain allowable subject matter. Claims 108-111, 114, 115, 118, 121-128, 130, 133, 136-143, 145, 147-151, 153 and 155-157 were rejected, and claim 143 was provisionally objected to. Claims 108, 125, 127, 134, 141, 143 and 150 have been amended to correct clerical errors and/or to clarify what the applicant regards as the invention, and claims 158-162 have been added, all for the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the goals of the Patent Office pursuant to 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (September 8, 2000), even though the Applicants believe that the previously pending claims were allowable. Further, formal drawings have been filed concurrently herewith.

Support for the amendments to the claims and the new claims can be found throughout the originally filed application, including the originally filed claims, the drawings and the specification. More specifically, support for the amendments to claims 108, 125, 127, 134, 141, 143 and 150, and for new claims 158-162, can be found at least in previously pending claims 129, 131, 132, 134, 135 and 152, in Figures 1, 2A-2E and 3A-3C, and in the specification at page 7, line 27 through page 12, line 16, and at page 13, line 17 through page 14, line 19.

No new matter is believed to have been added by this amendment. Consideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

Claim 143 was provisionally objected to pending allowability of claim 142, based on 37 CFR 1.75. The Applicants have amended claim 143 to correct an obvious clerical error. As amended, the provisional double patenting objection of claim 143 is believed to be moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 108-111, 114, 115, 118, 121-128, 130, 133, 136-143, 145, 147-151, 153 and 155-157 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Ma et al

(EP 1 113 437 A1). As provided above, the Applicants have amended independent claims 108, 125, 141 and 150, which are believed to be allowable as set forth below.

Ma et al is directed toward a “flexible disk stabilization using edge stiffener”. The disk described in detail in the cited reference is a “flexible or floppy magnetic disk that is formed of a thin ... flexible, circular base of polymeric film. Each side of the flexible disk is coated with a layer of magnetic recording material to form upper and lower recording surfaces.” (Col. 5, line 57 through Col. 6, line 5). Ma et al does not teach or suggest a hard disk drive having a storage disk with a substantially rigid base layer.

In contrast to Ma et al, amended claim 108 requires “a drive housing; and an asymmetrical storage disk that is rotatably coupled to the drive housing, the storage disk including a substantially rigid body region, a first side region that stores data and a second side region opposite the first side region, the body region being positioned between the side regions, the second side region including an exposed outer flat section and a raised stiffener that increases the rigidity of the storage disk, the stiffener extending at least approximately 0.001 millimeters away from the outer flat section.” These features are not taught or suggested by Ma et al. Therefore, a rejection of claim 108 would be unsupported by Ma et al, and claim 108 should be allowed. Because claims 109-124 depend directly or indirectly from claim 108, these claims should likewise be allowed.

Amended claim 125 requires “a drive housing; and an asymmetrical storage disk that is rotatably coupled to the drive housing, the storage disk including a substantially rigid body region, a first side region that stores data and a second side region opposite the first side region, the body region being positioned between the side regions, the second side region having an exposed second side surface including an outer flat section and an outer ridged section that extends at least approximately 0.001 millimeters above the outer flat section.” These features are not taught or suggested by Ma et al. Therefore, a rejection of claim 125 would be unsupported by Ma et al, and claim 125 should be allowed. Because claims 126-140 depend directly or indirectly from claim 125, these claims should likewise be allowed.

Further, amended claim 141 is directed toward a method that requires the step of “rotatably coupling a storage disk to a drive housing, the storage disk having a

substantially rigid body region, a first side region that stores data and a second side region opposite the first side region, the body region being positioned between the side regions, the second side region including an exposed outer flat section and a raised stiffener that increases the rigidity of the storage disk, the stiffener extending at least approximately 0.001 millimeters away from the outer flat section.” This step is not taught or suggested by Ma et al. Therefore, a rejection of claim 141 would be unsupported by Ma et al, and claim 141 should be allowed. Because claims 142-149 depend directly or indirectly from claim 141, these claims should likewise be allowed.

Amended claim 150 requires the step of “rotatably coupling a storage disk to a drive housing, the storage disk having a substantially rigid body region, a first side region that stores data and a second side region opposite the first side region, the body region being positioned between the side regions, the second side region having an exposed second side surface including an outer flat section and an outer ridged section that extends at least approximately 0.001 millimeters above the outer flat section.” This step is not taught or suggested by Ma et al. Therefore, a rejection of claim 150 would be unsupported by Ma et al, and claim 150 should be allowed. Because claims 151-157 depend directly or indirectly from claim 150, these claims should likewise be allowed.

Allowable Subject Matter / New Claims

Previously pending claims 112, 113, 116, 117, 119, 120, 129, 131, 132, 134, 135, 144, 146, 152 and 154 were found to contain allowable subject matter.

New independent claims 158-162 have been added by this amendment. New claims 158-162 are based on previously pending dependent claims 129, 131, 132, 134, 135 and 152, which were all found to contain allowable subject matter, substantially re-presented in independent form to incorporate the patentable subject matter. New claims 158-162 are not narrower in scope than these previously pending claims.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 108-162 are patentable for the reasons set forth above, and that the application is now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at 858-487-4077 for any reason that would advance the instant application to issue.

Dated this 8th day of September, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



JAMES P. BRODER
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,514

THE LAW OFFICE OF STEVEN G. ROEDER
5560 Chelsea Avenue
La Jolla, California 92037
Telephone: (858) 487-4077